

§ 205.210

in an amendment to an EFS and master list entry, is whatever change would render the master list entry no longer informative as to what is subject to the security interest in question. That will vary from case to case. The basis for this is the purpose for which the information is supplied, that is, to make information available, to a buyer, commission merchant, or selling agent who proposes to enter into a transaction in a product, whether it is subject to a security interest. The requirement to amend arises when the information already made available no longer serves the purpose and other information is needed in order to do so.

(b) Where an owner of a product makes a change, such as planting a different crop or purchasing different animals from what was represented, without informing the secured party, so that the master list entry is rendered not informative, but the EFS and master list are not amended through no fault of the secured party, the Section is silent as to the consequences. However, see the legislative history cited in § 205.208(f).

(c) The amendment must be filed in the same manner as the original filing. Note the requirement of subsection (c)(4)(D). The amendment may be filed electronically provided a State allows electronic filing of financing statements without the signature of the debtor under applicable State law under provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code. An electronically filed amendment need not be signed. However, if an original or reproduced paper document is filed, the amendment must be signed, authorized, or otherwise authenticated by the debtor, and be filed by the secured party.

(d) An effective financing statement remains effective for a period of 5 years from the date of filing and may be continued in increments of 5-year periods beyond the initial 5-year filing period by refiling an effective financing statement or by filing a continuation statement within 6 months before expiration of the effective financing statement. A continuation statement may be filed electronically or as a paper document, and need not be signed, au-

9 CFR Ch. II (1-1-08 Edition)

thorized, or otherwise authenticated by the debtor.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0580-0016)

[51 FR 29451, Aug. 18, 1986, as amended at 61 FR 54728, Oct. 22, 1996; 63 FR 66721, Dec. 3, 1998; 71 FR 56343, Sept. 27, 2006]

§ 205.210 Effect of EFS outside State in which filed.

(a) A question arises whether, if an EFS is filed in one State, a notice of it can be filed in another State and shown on the master list for the second State. There is nothing in the Section to prevent this, but it would serve no purpose.

(b) The Section provides only for filing an EFS, covering a given product, in the system for the State in which it is produced or located. Upon such filing in such system, subsections (e)(2) and (g)(2)(C) make buyers, commission merchants and selling agents *not registered* with that system subject to the security interest in that product whether or not they know about it, *even if they are outside that State*. Subsections (e)(3) and (g)(2)(D) make persons *registered* with that system subject if they receive written notice of it *even if they are outside that State*. All of these provisions apply only where an EFS is filed in the system for the State in which the product is produced or located. They do not apply to a filing in another system.

(c) What constitutes “receipt” of notice is determined by the law of the State in which the intended recipient of notice resides. This is based on subsection (f) which follows provisions for notice to buyers, and (g)(3) which follows provisions for notice to commission merchants and selling agents. Each of those provisions uses the word “buyer” but it means “intended recipient of notice.”

[51 FR 29451, Aug. 18, 1986, as amended at 71 FR 56343, Sept. 27, 2006]

§ 205.211 Applicability of court decisions under the UCC.

(a) Court decisions under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), about the scope of the “farm products” exception in Section 9-307(1) thereof, and

interpreting the terms therein, particularly “person engaged in farming operations” which is not defined in the Section, are applicable to an extent in interpreting the Section. The basis of this is the legislative intent of the Section to pre-empt State laws reflecting that “farm products” exception, as shown in the House Committee Report on Pub. L. 99-198, No. 99-271, Part 1, September 13, 1985, at pages 108 *et seq.*

(b) That UCC Section 9-307(1) reads as follows:

(1) A buyer in ordinary course of business (subsection (9) of Section 1-201) *other than a person buying farm products from a person engaged in farming operations* takes free of a security interest created by his seller even though the security interest is perfected and even though the buyer knows of its existence. (emphasis added)

§ 205.212 “Buyer in ordinary course of business” and “security interest.”

The terms “buyer in ordinary course of business” and “security interest” are defined in subsections (c) (1) and (7). There are differences between those definitions and the UCC definitions of the same terms. In interpreting those differences, the following would be pertinent:

(a) The legislative intent discussed above in §205.211, to pre-empt State laws reflecting the “farm products” exception; and

(b) The legislative intent shown in subsections (a) and (b) that certain persons take free and clear of certain interests of a “secured lender” “when the seller fails to repay the lender,” unless such persons have information about such interests made available to them as provided in the Section.

§ 205.213 Obligations subject—“person indebted”—“debtor.”

(a) A debt need not exist at the time of filing of an EFS. The basis for this is that subsection (c)(4) does not require the EFS, and subsection (c)(2)(C) does not require the master list, to show any amount of debt.

(b) The Section does not provide for the transaction in which one person subjects a product to a security interest for another’s debt. However the terms “person indebted” and “debtor” in the Section refer to the person who owns a product and subjects it to a se-

curity interest, whether or not that person owes a debt to the secured party. The basis for this is the purpose for which the information is supplied. Any buyer of a farm product, commission merchant, or selling agent querying a master list or system operator about a prospective seller of a farm product is interested in whether that seller has subjected that product to a security interest, not in whether the debt is owed by that seller or by another.

(c) Security interests existing prior to establishment of a system can be filed in such a system and reflected in the master list if documents are in existence or are created which meet the requirements of subsection (c)(4) besides filing, if such documents are filed wherever State law requires, and if the system operator receives the information about them needed for the master list.

(d) A system can be in compliance with the Section, although it reflects security interests not supported by EFS’s as defined in the legislation, and although it reflects security interests on items other than farm products. However, subsections (e) (2) and (3), and (g)(2) (C) and (D), will apply only as to entries reflecting farm products and supported by EFS’s as defined in the Section, and it must be possible to distinguish the entries to which these provisions apply from the other entries.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0580-0016)

[51 FR 29451, Aug. 18, 1986, as amended at 71 FR 56343, Sept. 27, 2006]

§ 205.214 Litigation as to whether a system is operating in compliance with the Section.

(a) The requirements for a system in subsection (c) are written as the definition of the term “central filing system,” so that failure of a system to meet any such requirement, either at the time of its establishment or later, will mean that it is not a “central filing system” as defined.

(b) The issue whether a system, after certification, is operating in compliance, thus whether it is a “central filing system” as defined, could be litigated and ruled on in a case involving only private parties, such as a lender